REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of March 29, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to express their appreciation for the Examiner's thorough analysis and articulate response to Applicants' previous submission. The Examiner's comments assisted Applicants' in formulating the claim amendments presented herein.

In the Office Action, the claims were rejected on the basis of new grounds of rejection, as noted at page 12 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,742 to Chari, *et al.* (hereinafter Chari) in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,764,913 to Jancke (hereinafter Jancke).

Applicants have amended each of the independent claims, Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 10, to emphasize certain aspects of the invention. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 11, line 20 – p. 12, line 1; p. 12, line 12 – p. 13, line 5; p. 15, lines 13-18; and p 17, line 8 – p. 18, line 18.) No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Applicants Invention

It may be useful at this juncture to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, exemplified by amended Claim 1, is a method of node exposing. The method can include obtaining from a display map, references corresponding to a plurality of nodes. Each node can be associated with a display element presented in the display map, and each such display element can include a plurality of selectively presentable

attributes. Each attribute can alternately be presented in one of a plurality of pre-selected visual formats, wherein each visual format corresponds to a different discrete quantized value obtained by quantizing a range of continuous data based upon a user-supplied instruction. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 12, lines 17-21; see also p. 17, line 8 – p. 18, line 17.)

The method can further include receiving at least one data metric from the component, and converting the at least one data metric into an updated quantized value that is obtained by quantizing another range of continuous data based upon yet another user-supplied instruction. Additionally, the method can include providing the updated value to the display map, wherein the display map can update the at least one corresponding display element to reflect the updated value. The steps of obtaining, receiving, converting, and providing steps, moreover, can be performed within a software agent.

The method also can include simultaneously displaying the display elements in a planar fashion; that is, in a single view. Moreover, within the display, the simultaneously displayed elements can be connected by visual lines illustrating the communication links that actually exist between each of the nodes represented by the display elements. (See, e.g., p. 11, line 18 – p. 12, line 1.)

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

As already noted, independent Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10 were each rejected as unpatentable over Chari in combination with the newly-cited reference, Jancke. Chari is directed to a system and method for displaying information with respect to various components of a system. Chari organizes the information according to "major" groups of components. (See Abstract, lines 1-7; see also Col. 4, lines 42-59.) Chari, more particularly,

organizes and presents "operational parameters" of the system components in "a plurality of hierarchical levels." (Col. 4, lines 42-59.)

Chari, however, fails to teach every feature of the invention. As pointed out at page 5 of the Office Action, Chari fails to teach or suggest presenting a visual display of parameters or attributes in a visual format corresponding to different discrete quantized values.

Nonetheless, Jancke is cited at page 5 of the Office Action as teaching this feature. Specifically, Jancke is cited as teaching the display of a graphical user interface comprising "a hierarchical display of nodes" in which an attribute of a node is "presented in one of a plurality of pre-selected visual formats, each visual format corresponding to a different discrete quantized value."

As further noted at page 5 the Office Action, Jancke's display of a system node includes "an individual operational state icon that takes on one of a plurality of different discrete forms, or values, corresponding to one of eight discrete values." The discrete values that an icon can represent are not quantized values of continuous data or real-numbers. The discrete values do not lie within a range of values, let alone represent continuous data. Indeed, the values are not even ordinal values. Instead, each value is merely an arbitrarily-assigned value that indicates which of a finite number of discrete operational states a system node is in, as observed in the Office Action. The nature of the values is explicitly described in Jancke in the context of indicating whether a component is operating, in pause mode, or stopped:

> "FIG. 4 illustrates a plurality of operational state indicia 400 for a plurality of operational state icons 410-417. Only one of the operational state indicia 400 at a time are displayed by a single node as illustrated in 230-233 of FIG. 2. Although eight states are used in the preferred embodiment, the present invention can accommodate any number of states that have meaning for a

particular application. Using operational state icon 410 as an example, the icon illustrates three primary node states including operational, paused, and stopped. An icon having the characteristics of a stop light is used in the preferred embodiment to indicate that a node is operational by the green light position 422, paused by the yellow light position 421, and stopped by the red light position 420. Therefore, operational state icon 410 indicates an operational state of stopped 420. Operational state icon 411 indicates an operational state of paused 421. Operational state icon 412 indicates an operational state of operational or running 422. Operational state icon 413 has all status indicator lights blank which indicates an unknown operational state of a corresponding node." (Col. 3, lines 7-55.) (Emphasis supplied.)

As the quoted language reveals, Jancke's indicator values corresponding to discrete states of a component do not even need not be quantized because the values do not correspond to a range of numbers. Jancke thus does not contemplate quantizing numbers lying within a range of values, such as those lying along the real-number line, or continuous data such as percentage values lying between zero and one (See Specification, p. 17, line 8 – p. 18, line 16).

It follows that Jancke does not teach or suggest presenting a quantized value of a particular node attribute that has been obtained by quantizing a range of continuous data based upon a user-supplied instruction, as recited in each of amended independent Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10. Indeed, it is this quantization of a range of values according to the invention that permits a user to establish when a particular node attribute lies between a defined maximum and a defined minimum value. (See Specification, p. 12, lines 17-21.) No such capability is provided by Jancke since operational states are arbitrarily assigned indicator values and do not lie within a range of continuous data; no value corresponding to a

particular operational state presents a range of continuous data that can be a maximum or a minimum with respect to other values within the given range of values.

Moreover, Jancke, by failing to teach or suggest quantizing continuous data, further fails to teach or suggest that the quantization of continuous data can explicitly be based on a quantized value dictated by a user-supplied instruction, as further recited in each of the amended independent claims. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 12, lines 6-16.)

Still another fundamental difference between Applicants' invention, on one hand, and both Jancke and Chari, on the other, lies in the manner in which display elements corresponding to system nodes are visually presented. As explicitly recited in each of the references and also noted in the Office Action, both Jancke and Chari organize and present attributes in a "hierarchical" manner. This is fundamentally different from presenting simultaneously in a single view each of various display elements representing attributes of different system nodes. Jancke's and Chari's hierarchical presentment, as especially demonstrated in the various figures of each reference, requires a user's moving seriatim from one view screen to another.

Indeed, even more fundamentally, neither Jancke nor Chari provide for a single view of display elements corresponding to different system nodes. Rather, Jancke and Chari both provide a hierarchical presentment of attributes for a single node of the system, not a single view of each. It follows, moreover, that neither reference teaches or suggests simultaneously displaying elements corresponding to a plurality of nodes wherein the various display elements are connected by visual lines that illustrate the physical communication links existing between each of the actual nodes represented by the display elements, as also recited in amended independent Claims 1, 4, 6, and 10.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 29, 2006**

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000